



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/744,424	01/24/2001	Toshiyuki Nakamura	1217-010064	5656

7590 01/29/2002
Russell D Orkin
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1818
ET AV

EXAMINER

CUNEO, KAMAND

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2827	

DATE MAILED: 01/29/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER <i>CY7744724</i>	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTY DOCKET NO.
		EXAMINER	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER <i>6</i>

DATE MAILED:

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

- Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
 This action is FINAL.
 Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 010 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- Claim(s) 116 - 134 is/are pending in the application.
Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
 Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 Claim(s) 116 - 134 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
 The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
 The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.
 The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
 received.
 received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
 received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

- Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892
 Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
 Interview Summary, PTO-413
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 116-122, drawn to a product, classified in class 174, subclass 262.
 - II. Claims 123-134, drawn to a method, classified in class 29, subclass 825.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons. Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product can be made by drilling the through hole and electroplating the conductive material within it or by connecting multiple boards together, then drilling and electroplating so as to obviate the need for a protruding metal portion.
3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Also because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group II is not required for Group I, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
4. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the

claimed invention: as listed below. *Applicant is warned that the species requirement is made to the best of examiner's ability given the confusing specification which does not include descriptions of many of the figures such as figure 15 and figures 17-21. Applicant is encouraged to correct the specification for these and other errors in response to this requirement so that a thorough examination can be performed on the first action.*

species a defined by figure 1,

species b defined by figure 5,

species c defined by figure 6,

species d defined by figure 7,

species e defined by figure 8,

species f defined by figure 9,

species g defined by figure 10,

species h defined by figure 12,

species i defined by figure 13,

species j defined by figure 14,

species k defined by figure 15,

species l defined by figure 17,

species m defined by figure 18,

species n defined by figure 20,

species o defined by figure 22,

species p defined by figure 24.

5. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Currently, no claims are generic.

6. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

7. A telephone call was made to Mr. Baldauf on 1/23/02 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

8. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

9. Any inquiries related to the examination of this application should be directed to Ex. K. Cuneo at (703) 308-1233 or her supervisor SPE D. Talbott at (703) 305-9883. Inquiries of a general nature should be directed to the receptionist of Group 2800 at (703) 308-0956. The fax numbers for Group 2800 are (703) 308-7722 and 7724.



K. Cuneo
Primary Examiner
January 23, 2002